

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 7-19, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 31-36 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 2-4, 7-19, 21, 22, 25, and 26, has canceled claims 1, 5, 6, 20, 23, 24, and 27-30, and has added new claims 31-36. These changes are not believed to introduce any new matter.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's prompt indication that claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 16, 17, 22, and 26 define allowable subject matter. Applicant has rewritten claims 2 and 3 in independent format to place these claims in condition for allowance. Applicant's responses to the issues raised in the Office Action are set forth in the following discussion.

In response to the objection to claims 6 and 25 due to informalities, Applicant has amended the claims to correct the informality in claim 25 (as noted above, Applicant has herein canceled claim 6). Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant has amended claims 25 and 26 to specify that the computer program is embodied on a computer-readable medium (as noted above, Applicant has herein canceled claims 23 and 24). Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 25 and 26 define statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and requests that the rejection of these claims thereunder be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7-12, 16-19, 21, 22, and 27 under 35 U.S. C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite (as noted above, Applicant has herein canceled claim 5). Applicant has amended the claims to provide proper antecedent basis for the claim terminology cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 7-12, 16-19, 21, 22, and 27 now satisfy the definiteness requirement of 35

U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and requests that the rejection of these claims thereunder be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4, 8-10, 13-15, 21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hidaka* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,320,980 B1) (as noted above, Applicant has herein canceled claims 1, 5, 6, 20, 23, 24, and 27-30). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Hidaka* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in independent claims 8, 13, 21, and 25, as amended herein.

The *Hidaka* reference discloses a technique for color conversion between body color image data and light source color image data. Specifically, the *Hidaka* reference discloses a technique for learning the relation for matching a body color and a light source color with each other, with respect to a certain color, and using the relation to obtain color conversion parameters.

Independent claim 8 defines a color space converting apparatus that corrects an error that is attributed to a composite matrix, i.e., the first matrix, the second matrix, and the third matrix specified in the claim. The *Hidaka* reference does not disclose the constituent features required for correcting an error that is attributed to a composite matrix, much less all of the other features recited in claim 8. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Hidaka* reference does not disclose each and every feature specified in claim 8, as amended herein.

Independent claim 13 defines a color space converting apparatus that improves color space conversion accuracy when the color value of the white point of the first color space and the color value of the white point of the second color space do not match in the device-independent color space. To this end, one of the features specified in claim 13 is “a determining module for determining whether a color value of a first white point in the device-independent color space, converted from the color value of the white point of the first color space by the first converting module, matches a color value of a second white point in the

device-independent color space, converted from the color value of the white point of the second color space by the second converting module.”

The *Hidaka* reference provides no disclosure concerning the determining of the match or non-match of a white point and another white point in the device-independent color space. Moreover, *Hidaka*'s configuration always uses a color measurement of an output image on a monitor (after the RGB process) to obtain a correction coefficient for eliminating a deviation. Thus, the *Hidaka* reference does not disclose each and every feature of claim 13, as amended herein, for at least the reason that this reference does not disclose the above-quoted feature of claim 13.

Independent claims 21 and 25 define a method and a computer program, respectively, that include features that correspond to those specified in claim 13. As such, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 13 also apply to claims 21 and 25.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 8, 13, 21, and 25 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Hidaka*. Claims 9 and 10, each of which depends from claim 8, and claims 14 and 15, each of which depends from claim 13, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Hidaka* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim. Regarding claim 4, this claim depends claim 2 or claim 3. As noted above, claims 2 and 3 have been rewritten in independent format to place them in condition for allowance. As such, claim 4 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Hidaka* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 2 or claim 3.

As noted above, Applicant has added new claims 31-36. New independent claims 31 and 33 define a method and a computer program, respectively, that include the constituent features of claim 2 incorporated in the subject matter specified in original claim 20, which has been canceled herein. New independent claims 32 and 34 define a method and computer

program, respectively, that include the constituent features of claim 3 incorporated in the subject matter specified in original claim 23, which has been canceled herein. As claims 2 and 3 have been indicated to define allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 31-34 are patentable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 35 defines a color space converting apparatus that includes, among other features, "a correcting module that determines whether a color value of a first white point of the first color space converted from the first color space to the second color space, matches the color value of a second white point in the second color space, and that corrects the color space converting module, when the color value of the first white point of the first color space converted from the first color space to the second color space and the color value of the second white point do not match." As discussed above with respect to claim 13, the *Hidaka* reference provides no disclosure regarding the configuration specified in claim 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is patentable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 36 defines a method of color space conversion. The method operations recited in claim 36 correspond to the method operations performed by the color space converting apparatus defined in claim 35. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 35, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 is patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 2-4, 7-19, 21, 22, 25, and 26, as amended herein, as well as examination of new claims 31-36, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with

Application No. 10/099,887
Amendment dated October 30, 2006
Response to Office Action mailed June 29, 2006

the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit
Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP011).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Martine', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920